To: R.S. ewis
BullmAt Sci

RADIATION HAZARDS / yours of 12.17.70

I had meant to stay in closer touch with you about your plans for this issue.

IN ANY EVENT, it seems to me that it would be unfortunate to continue a debate on a set of premises that are already obsolete (namely that the 170 mr standard is being defacto defended). Also I have every hope that the AEC is going through a crisis of decision that may result in further formalization of their expectations.

This does not seem like a good time for a journal on a monthly schedule to seize on the issue. But if you do, I hope you will give fair representation to Seaborg's statement -- not only by publishing its import, but by looking for a fair recognition that this is current policy in the other pieces that you accept (or by appropriate editorial comment if its is ignored.)

When the d ust has settled, there will be plenty of room for further analysis on the basis of these new premmises.

If you are still moving ahead-- do you want to use this particular piece, or suggest any small scale revisions that might adapt it better to your own nmeds?

By coincidence Miss Cullen's letter of 5/4 just
arrived. If I can have another month (from now)
I will amplify the economic argument; but I will
be interested meanwhile in your reactions to ethe
above.

ł		
ł		

PROFESSOR JOSHUA LEDERBERG Department of Genetics School of Medicine Stanford University Stanford, California 94305